

ARGUMENTS/REMARKS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application.

Claims 1-10 and 23-27 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 7 and 23 are independent.

Claims 1, 7 and 23 have been amended. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6 and 23-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kubo, in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,017,156 to Moriyama, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,408,345A to Mitsui et al. (Mitsui). Claims 7-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,295,109B1 to Kubo et al. (Kubo), in view of Mitsui. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Kubo discloses a reflective pixel electrode 30, gate lines 21 and data lines 22 (see Figs. 8A and 8B). The Examiner admits that the reflective pixel electrode 30 does not entirely overlap a gate line adjacent to the gate line connected to the gate of the transistor in each pixel, and also admits that Kubo fails to teach a reflecting film on an inner side of the first transparent substrate adjacent to the liquid crystal layer, the reflecting film defining a light-transmitting region, wherein said light transmitting region is disposed between

an inner edge of a gate line and a side of an outer edge periphery of said reflecting film. The Applicant agrees.

The Applicant observes that the reflective pixel electrode 30 only *slightly overlaps* each of gate lines 21 and data lines 22. The slight overlap is not substantial enough to form a storage capacitance as set forth in the Applicant's specification (see page 10, lines 8-12). While it is clear that neither Mitsui, nor Moriyama can supply the vacancy of Kubo, Applicant notes that Mitsui is directed to a reflection type liquid crystal display device, and accordingly, cannot be validly applied as prior art against the Applicant's transmission-reflection type liquid crystal display device. Even so, like Kubo, neither Moriyama, nor Mitsui teaches a reflective film overlapping a gate line *substantially*.

Particularly, Kubo fails to teach or suggest a reflecting film on an inner side of the first transparent substrate adjacent to the liquid crystal layer, the reflecting film defining a light-transmitting region, wherein said light transmitting region is disposed between an inner edge of a gate line and a side of an outer edge periphery of said reflecting film in each pixel, an opposing side of said reflecting film overlapping an adjacent gate line substantially, as recited in independent claim 1 (as amended) and similarly stated in independent claims 7 and 23 (as amended). Reconsideration and withdrawal of these art grounds of rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-6, 8-10 and 24-27 depend, either directly, or indirectly on independent claims 1, 7 and 23, which are allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 2-6, 8-10 and 24-27 are allowable based on their dependence from claims 1, 7 and 23. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Percy L. Square, Registration No. 51,084, at (703) 205-8034, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Application No.: 09/559,403
Art Unit 2871

Attorney Docket No. 0465-0711P
Amendment filed December 12, 2003
Page 11

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By: 

Joseph A. Kolasch
Reg. No.: 22,463

JAK
JAK/PLS:gf:ndb

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
Telephone: (703)205-8000

0465-0711P